



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,661	10/16/2001	Thomas Walburgis Bakker	W422.312-6	7397
7590	02/03/2011		EXAMINER	
Kinney & Lange Suite 1500 625 Fourth Avenuen South Minneapolis, MN 55415-1659			THOMPSON, KENNETH L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2011	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/889,661	BAKKER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kenneth Thompson	3672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2001.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to because the recitation “Figuur” should be changed to “Figure”. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The recitation “said internal barrier” lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 15, 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Priestman et al., U.S. 2,548,616 in view of Westin et al., U.S. 2,371,090.

Priestman et al. discloses a method for inserting a tube (12) into a borehole (11) of a bored well in the ground, comprising successively adding a straight tube (col. 4, lines 20-40) part to a proximal end of the tube while the tube reaches into the borehole, and subsequently inserting the tube further in the borehole, wherein the addition of the tube part is carried out by means of welding (col. 4, lines 34-40) inherently leaving a bead substantially as thick as the tube. Priestman et al. does not disclose is silent regarding a tool in an area for performing a reaming operation in the area where the added tube part is welded to the tube, for making an inner wall surface of the tube smoother. Westin et al. teaches use of a tool (fig 1) for performing a reaming or scarfing (p. 2, rt. lines 38-50) operation in the area where the added tube part is welded to the tube. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a tool for machining the edges of the welded pipe as taught by Westin et al. to improve the strength of the joint since surface preparation for welded metal joints is well known in the art.

Priestman et al. discloses welding takes place on a side of the curved pipe benders (29) opposite the borehole (11; col. 1, lines 17-25) in a horizontal position.

Priestman et al. discloses use of various pipe sizes (col. 4, lines 50-66) but not specifically 20 meters. However it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select a well known pipe size to achieve predictable results.

Claims 4, 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Priestman et al., U.S. 2,548 in view of Gordon et al., U.S. 6,220,498.

Priestman et al. discloses all the claimed limitations except for the welding apparatus. Gordon et al. teaches use of a welding enclosure 10) or screened area having arms (32) for orienting the tubing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of a well known device to achieve predictable results.

Claims 12-14, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Priestman et al., U.S. 2,548 in view of Thode, U.S. 5,390,846.

Priestman et al. disclose all the claimed limitations including welding pipe ends but does not disclose the welding procedure wherein the pipe is internally sealed and provided with purging gas. Thode teaches use of sealing the interior of a pipe at an area to be welded to ensure the weld bead is not contaminated (col. 2, lines 60-66). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of a well known device to achieve predictable results.

Claims 10, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Priestman et al., U.S. 2,548 in view of Helms, U.S. 5,735,351.

Priestman et al. discloses a tube straightener at the well but not a sealing packoff. Helms teaches use of a sealing packoff. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of a well known device to achieve predictable results.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Thompson whose telephone number is (571)272-7037. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

31 January 2011

/Kenneth Thompson/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3672